DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 147 047 RC 010 131

AUTHOR Kim, Dong I.; And Others
TITLE Social Change, Anomy and Alienation in Low-Income Areas of the Rural South.
PUB DATE 1 Sep 77
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rural Sociological Society (Madison, Wisconsin, September 1-4, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Definitions; Factor Analysis; Low Income Counties; *Psychological Characteristics; Quality of Life; Rural Areas; *Rural Population; *Social Change; *Southern States; *Urbanization
IDENTIFIERS *Alienation; *Anomie; Durkheim (Emile)

ABSTRACT

Theories of social change suggest that both anomy and alienation should increase among low-income people experiencing rapid social change. To more sharply distinguish the causal relationship between social change and the state of peoples' minds in rural and semirural areas of the South, separate hypotheses were developed for anomy (Durkheim's anomie) and alienation (Durkheim's egoism). The sample compared data drawn from 23 low-income counties in the six southern states in 1960-61 and in 1972-73, with change in degree of urbanization as the indicator of social change. Factor analysis was used to develop measures of the two dependent variables, alienation and anomy. Data analysis showed that anomy increased while alienation decreased between 1960 and 1973, but as urbanization increased, both anomy and alienation declined, suggesting social change does not always adversely affect psychological states, particularly in parts of society which have lagged behind. Because of the differences between anomy and alienation changes, continued distinction between them was seen as important. Data indicated that increase in anomy may stem not from rapid social change but from lack of urbanization and that alienation decreased more in relation to increasing urbanization--findings with important implications for policy decisions. (RS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

Rc24-10-77

ED147047

SOCIAL CHANGE, ANOMY AND ALIENATION IN LOW-INCOME AREAS OF THE RURAL SOUTH*

By

Dong I. Kim
Morehead State University

A. Lee Coleman
University of Kentucky

C. Milton Coughenour
University of Kentucky

*Prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the Rural Sociological Society, September 1-4, 1977 at Madison, Wisconsin. The research on which this paper is based was supported by the Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Kentucky, Lexington. Kentucky, Projects 815 and 822.

PC 010131

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dong I. Kim

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ABSTRACT

The major hypothesis is that there is a casual relationship between social change and the state of individuals' minds--anomy and alienation--in underdeveloped, low-income rural and semi-rural counties of the South. Change in degree of urbanization is taken as the indicator of social change and operationalized through factor analysis. A theoretical argument was developed for distinguishing more sharply between anomy and alienation, so that a different question must be stated for each. Alienation is conceived of as the social-psychological consequence of its structural counterpart, inadequate social structure (Durkheim's egoism), and anomy is seen as a consequence of unstable normative structure (Durkheim's anomie). The data analysis suggests that anomy increased while alienation decreased between 1960 and 1973. Also, it was found that as urbanization increases, both anomy and alienation decline in these low-income rural counties of the South. Thus, rapid social change does not always adversely affect the psychological state of the people experiencing it but may in fact be integrative in areas that have lagged behind.

SOCIAL CHANGE, ANOMY AND ALIENATION IN
LOW-INCOME AREAS OF THE RURAL SOUTH

The major theme of this study is that there is a causal relationship between social change, as indicated by change in the degree of urbanization, and the state of the individual's mind, anomy[1] and alienation, for people living in low-income areas of the South. In a stable society social interaction becomes habitual and customary, directed and sanctioned by social values and norms. When the social system is subject to sudden or rapid change resulting from external or internal forces, social stability and integration may break down, and patterns of human behavior are no longer predictable (Durkheim, 1964, 1966, and 1973). Thus, many studies indicate that certain kinds of social change, e.g., rapid urbanization and industrialization, promote individual and societal disorganization, alienation and anomy (Sharp, 1952; Smelser, 1959, 1963; Eisenstadt, 1966; Etzioni, 1968; Lystadt, 1972; Durkheim, 1973).

By social change we mean change in both or either social structure and normative structure (i.e., changes in the parts of a structure due to changes in other parts). Normative structure refers to an interrelated set of values and norms which are patterned, regulated and shared by the members of society. Social structure is an interrelated set of social relationships, i.e., patterned and routinized human interactions, based on normative structure. This distinction for analytical purposes is crucial to understanding Durkheim's distinction between egoism and anomie and their social-psychological counterparts, alienation and anomy.

---

[1] The term anomy is used here to indicate a social-psychological state of individuals in contrast to anomie, which is conceived as a structural condition.

Durkheim's Anomie and Egoism

Durkheim believed, particularly as stated in his Division of Labor, that functional differentiation without subsequent structural integration and normative regulation is problematic. Furthermore, in a period of sudden depression, prosperity, or rapid technological change, "something like a de-classification occurs" and in this situation the individual's reactions to sudden social change are without direction and meaning. A state of malfunctioning and malintegration of the social system occurs (Durkheim, 1966;252).

Malfunctioning of the social system may result in one or both of two pathologies: egoism or lack of social integration, and anomie or lack of normative regulation. Durkheim seems to have made an analytical distinction between the social structural and the normative structural poles of the "nomic" process, inasmuch as he distinguished egoism and anomie. Thus, Dirkheim used "egoism" to indicate defects in social structure and "anomie" to identify normative deficiency in the social system.[2] Although Durkheim's discussion is somewhat ambiguous, he used egoism and anomie to differentiate the social and normative structural defects of the social process consistently throughout his works, including his Moral Education (published in 1925). Furthermore, Durkheim did not forget to mention the different psychological manifestations of these two structural conditions. The psychological consequences of egoism are feelings of isolation, dissociation, purposelessness, meaninglessness and ultimately "sad depression." And, Durkheim (1973:73) contends, "an egoist . . . bottles himself up and

---

[2]Marks (1974) discussed Durkheim's distinction between anomie and egoism in detail. However, the writer's ideas about this problem were formulated earlier and thus independently from Marks' work, although the ideas do not differ substantially.

alienates himself from men and things." The behavioral consequence of egoism is egoistic suicide, which results from the feeling of alienation and isolation. In a word, the feeling of alienation and its behavioral consequence, egoistic suicide, results from a deficiency of social interaction and lack of social integration. On the other hand, the psychological manifestations of anomie on the individual level are feelings of "pessimism" and "dejection" and the behavioral consequence of this could be anomic suicide (Durkheim, 1973:68).

Finally, it might be added, Durkheim's analytical distinction between egoism as a defect in social structure (relationships or interactions) and anomie as a pathology in normative structure (regulative mechanism) gives us a clue to distinguish our problematic concepts of alienation and anomie. Alienation can be thought of as a psychological state stemming from defective social interaction. According to Durkheim (1966), the cutting-off of interaction (on the behavioral level and/or the psychological level) leads to such feelings as purposelessness, meaninglessness, self-isolation and "sad depression" or "melancholy." The psychological manifestation of anomie (e.g., anomy as in this paper or anomia as Srole calls it), on the other hand, is the feeling of uncertainty, confusion, pessimism, and despair stemming from the breakdown of the normative structure (Durkheim, 1966, 1973).[3] Apparently, one can have one malady without the other, although they are closely related. Thus, Durkheim points out that although both anomie and egoism spring from "society's insufficient presence in individuals," they are independent of each other:

---

[3]The writer's formal definitions of alienation and anomy, to be presented in the discussion of definitions and measures of variables, are more or less consistent with the above discussed Durkheim position. It is worth remembering that Durkheim was familiar with Marx's theory of alienation. See Gouldner (1967).

"one may live in an anomic state without being egoistic, and vice versa" (Durkheim, 1966:258).

Srole's Anomia: Measure of Anomy, Alienation, or Both?

While Srole (1956a) claimed that his anomia scale was constructed as an index to Durkheim's concept of anomie, he defined anomia as the individual's "self-to-others distance and self-to-others alienation." He writes, "in the writer's view, 'self-to-others alienation' may be regarded as the common element in Durkheim's conceptualization of anomie, egoism, altruism and fatalism as different but often overlapping forms of suicide" (Srole, 1956a:711-12). Thus, Srole suggests that anomia is the individual's psychological state or an expression of a subjective perception of societal egoism, anomie, etc. At the same time, he regards his scale as a general indicator of alienation from society. Apparently, Srole failed to distinguish Durkheim's anomie and egoism (let alone altruism and fatalism) on the conceptual level and thus he did not distinguish their psychological states, anomy and alienation.[4] Meier and Bell (1959:191) seem to have recognized this problem and suggested that despair, utter hopelessness, and discouragement were major parts of what the Srole scale actually measured, "although alienation appears to be measured in some degree as well."

Srole measures anomia in terms of agreement with five different items:

(1) There's little use in writing public officials because often they aren't really interested in the problems of the average man.

---

[4] A Similar lapse seems apparent in the work of Merton (1964), who regards Srole's anomia as the social-psychological consequence of anomie. Merton also uses such terms as "estrangement" or "alienation" and says people become "estranged from society" when they are caught up in a disjunction between "society" and "culture." Srole's anomia is thus for Merton (1964:218) an individual attribute, that is, "withdrawal of allegiance from one or another part of prevailing social standards" or "estrangement from society."

(2) Nowadays a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.

(3) In spite of what some people say, the lot of the average man is getting worse, not better.

(4) It's hardly fair to bring children into the world with the way things look for the future.

(5) These days a person doesn't really know whom he can count on.

Among these five items, the first one seems to measure the feeling of powerlessness (in particular, political powerlessness) which may result from a deficiency or cutting-off of interaction between the powers and the people. Obviously, then, the first item measures alienation (and, for that matter, Durkheim's egoism). The fifth one seems to measure the individual's sense of distrust, which may be a consequence of a deficiency in social interactions and social relationships. It may be fair to say that an individual is alienated from others, insofar as he does not trust them.[5] Thus, Srole's fifth item measures distrust, which may be a component of the alienation concept or a dimension associated with alienation (i.e., in Srole's words, "self-to-others distance and alienation").

The rest of the Srole items seem to measure something different from political powerlessness and distrust, as Seeman (1972, 1975) also points out. In Srole's own words, the second item "measures the individual's sense of uncertainty and perception of orderlessness in the social system."

---

[5]As Gamson (1968), Schacht (1970) and Seeman (1972, 1975) have recently noted, the idea of political alienation often includes a trust dimension as well. However, Seeman points out, "whether trust ought to be included along with efficacy in a measure of alienation is a question that cannot be settled by definition." Some others have utilized these dimensions--powerlessness and trust--as related but independent variables (Hamsher, Geller and Rotter, 1968). Also, Fischer's (1973) three items measuring his "social isolation," are very similar to the fifth item of the Srole scale.

The third item seems to indicate a feeling that life is retrogressing, or a sense of pessimism, while the fourth item indicates a sense of futility, hopelessness, and confusion. In sum, these three items seem to measure various degrees of "despair," "hopelessness," "discouragement," and "demoralization" (Meier and Bell, 1959; McDill, 1961; Neal and Seeman, 1964; Seeman, 1972, 1975). Essentially, according to Durkheim, this characteristic of "despair" is the major psychological consequence of anomie.

Thus, Srole's scale seems to measure both anomy and alienation, as aspects of the individual's psychological state.[6] Since the later theoretical propositions of this study will be tested in terms of this conceptual framework, the first task in the data analysis will be an attempt to build indices of both alienation and anomy from Srole's five items.

Anomy, Alienation and Social Change: Hypotheses

Studies have shown that certain kinds of social change increase mental illness (Murphy, 1961; Lauer and Lauer, 1964), individual and social disorganization (Sharp, 1952; Smelser, 1959; Balander, 1970), alienation (Etzioni, 1968; Lystadt, 1972) and anomie (Smelser, 1963; Eisenstadt, 1966). While the disruptive effects of rapid social change - in particular, of urbanization and industrialization - have been pointed out by many others (Sorokin, 1942; Nisbet, 1969; Richards, 1970; Marlowe, 1971; Berger et al., 1973) and some of these writers have been more or less pessimistic as

---

[6] Srole has shown that his five items form a Guttman scale on a sizeable number of people. However, the present analysis does not support this claim. The coefficient of reproducibility for our 1960-61 data was.79 and the coefficient of scalability was only .34, far below the criteria levels suggested by Guttman (1950)--.90 for the reproducibility and .60 for scalability. The coefficient of reproducibility based on our 1972-73 sample was .77 and that for scalability was .44.

indicated by the phrase, "future shock" (Toffler, 1970), neither Marx nor Durkheim was as pessimistic as commonly thought by intellectuals. Both of these classical theorists recognized that rapid social change based on increasing division of labor is inevitable along with the development of science and technology. Nevertheless, Marx (1964) saw the remedy for alienation in the future communistic society and Durkheim (1964) believed that "organic solidarity" with new morality and adjustment to industrialization would come in the future. In fact, numerous studies indicate little or no increase in rates of mental illness or severe disorder during periods of rapid social change (Lerner, 1958; Lopreato, 1967; Freeman and Giovannoni, 1969).

Hypotheses: Until recently, the sample of counties selected for this study have been relatively neglected and isolated from the mainstream of American industrialization and urbanization. During the past two or three decades, however, and particularly during the 1960's the people of the low-income study areas have experienced a great deal of social change, outmigration, and especially increased federal intervention in the form of manpower training, economic development, welfare programs and other public aid. This rapid and sudden social change may have had both positive and negative impacts on the social-psychological state of the residents. The negative could be an increase in anomy during the 1960's, due to the residents exposure to rapid change and their experiencing a sort of transition period of change. The positive could be a decrease in alienation, since residents who were living in long isolation and poverty with lesser opportunity began to have increased interaction with outsiders such as public officials and social welfare agencies. From this argument

two major hypotheses are generated.

(1) There has been an increase of anomy during the period 1960-73.

(2) There has been a decrease of alienation during the period 1960-73.

If anomy increased and alienation decreased in this time period, this does not prove directly the main thesis of this study that there is a relationship between social change and anomy in these underdeveloped areas. Thus, the third and fourth hypotheses are concerned with relationships between the degree of social change, as measured by the change in the degree of urbanization and anomy and alienation.

(3) There is a positive relationship between change in the degree of urbanization and anomy in the period 1960-73.

(4) There is a negative relationship between change in the degree of urbanization and alienation in the period 1960-73.

The next research question is: Do variations in change in the degree of urbanization have different effects on anomy or alienation, depending upon how rural or urban the county is? People in urban areas that had been exposed to rapid social change earlier than rural areas may have had time to adjust to modern industrialization and urbanization, and further social change may have had less influence on the psychological state of the urban residents than of that of rural people. Thus, a positive relationship between urbanization and anomy would be stronger in areas with low urbanity than in those of high urbanity. However, consistent with Hypothesis 4, the decrease of alienation as a result of increasing urbanization should be greater in the areas of low urbanity than in areas of high urbanity. The fifth and sixth hypotheses thus are:

(5) The positive relationship between change in the degree of urbanization and anomy is stronger in areas of low urbanity than in areas of high urbanity.

(6) The inverse relationship between change in the degree of urbanization and alienation is stronger in areas of low urbanity than in areas of high urbanity.

In addition to the difference in terms of the degree of urbanity, several other background variables were controlled to clarify the expected relationship between social change and anomy or alienation. These control variables are age, sex, socioeconomic status and family income. Studies indicate that age (Srole, 1956a; Bell, 1957; Meier and Bell, 1959; Mizruchi, 1960, 1964; Simpson and Miller, 1963; Rhodes, 1964) is related to anomy or alienation. However, few studies, if any, have been concerned with the relationship between the other background variables, social change, and anomy or alienation. Thus, in the present study these variables are controlled for exploratory rather than explanatory purposes and no formal hypotheses are presented here.

THE DATA

Sample--Two samples are involved in this study. The first sample was drawn from 23 low-income counties in the six Southern states during 1960 and 1961.* The sample was selected by a probability method from state, county, and sub-area strata within the region. The definition of "low-income counties" was based on the area's fulfillment of two or more of the following criteria as of 1950:

1. Less than $1,000 residual farm income to operator and family, with level-of-living index below the regional average and 23 percent or more of the commercial farms classified as "low-production".

2. Level-of-living index in lowest fifth of the nation's counties.

* Originally 26 counties.

3. Fifty percent or more of commercial farms classified as "low-production" (United States Department of Agriculture, 1955).

The second sample was also drawn from the same low income counties of the six Southern states and designed to be representative of families in these counties. The second survey was carried out in 1972-1973. In both of the studies, whites and non-whites were included in the samples and data were collected by interview with a standardized schedule. In the second study either heads of households or their spouses were interviewed, while in the first study both the head of the household and the spouse were interviewed. Also, whereas the first sample was exclusively representative of open-country families in the low-income counties, the second sample included a small portion of town families. In several states, thus, for matching, the town families in the second sample will be excluded.

Although information regarding alienation and anomy was secured from individuals' responses, the unit of analysis in this study is the county rather than the individual. Since alienation and anomy are individual properties, aggregated values of anomy and alienation scores were assigned to each county. The rationale for choosing the county as the unit of analysis is that in taking a structural approach we are concerned with the question of how structural conditions affect the social-psychological states of individuals in these areas.

Indexes and Scales--1. Factor analysis was used to develop measures of the two dependent variables, alienation and anomy, from Srole's anomia items. Alienation is defined as the social-psychological separation of a person from some social referent as a result of social structural pathology. In the present study, the referent from which a person feels alienated is either the government (political powerlessness), or other people (interpersonal alienation). Interpersonal alienation is conceived as associated

with the individual's feeling of distrust. It was assumed that Srole's items 1 and 5 (see list, page 4 and 5) would load on one factor. Anomy refers to the individual's psychological state resulting from anomie and is manifested by, or associated with feelings of uncertainty, orderlessness, futility, demoralization, or despair. The other three Srole items (2, 3, and 4) should load on the other factor and would thus be used as an index of anomy.

Both schedules contained eight items, including the five original Srole items, to measure a respondent's attitude toward life or society. Three responses to each item were possible; arbitrary scores were assigned as follows:

Response	Score
Disagree	1
Don't Know	2
Agree	3

Higher scores indicate greater anomy or alienation in an individual's attitude.

The three non-Srole items of the scale, getting at the respondents' subjective assesments of different aspects of the social situation and their lives, are as follows:

(6) Even if his family objects, a man should choose a job that he thinks is best for him.

(7) If a man loses his job, he can fall back on his relatives for help.

(8) Things have usually gone against me in life.

Item 8 relates closely to items 2, 3, and 4, which are assumed to measure anomy. Items 6 and 7 do not appear to be measures of either anomy or alienation, yet they are not totally irrelevant to anomy and alienation.

The analysis of the 1960-61 survey data generated two factors supporting the conceptualization of anomy and alienation as two different variables. However, the analysis of the 1972-73 data did not produce two factors fitting this operationalization of anomy and alienation. Although it is difficult to determine what caused this inconsistency between the results of the factor analyses of the data for the two times, our conceptualizations of anomy and alienation were at least partially supported.

2. Change in the degree of urbanization of the county in the 10-year period, 1960-1970 was used as the indicator of the degree of social change in the same period. Urbanization is conceived as the process of social change in which an increasingly larger proportion of a society's population resides in urban areas and distinctive patterns of social and normative structure that are different from the rural way of life emerge. The following ten items were selected from the 1960 and 1970 censuses to be factor-analyzed for the development of a county index of urbanization change during the 10-year period:

(1) Percentage of urban population

(2) Percentage of urban and rural-nonfarm population combined

(3) Population per square mile

(4) Percentage of population born out of state

(5) Percentage of males college educated

(6) Percentage of white collar workers

(7) Percentage of labor force employed in nonagricultural occupations

(8) Percentage of women in labor force

(9) Percentage of persons employed outside county.

(10) Percentage of single-family housing units

A factor analysis of percentage changes in the ten variables between 1960 and 1970 generated three factors. Among these three, one factor on which four variables were heavily loaded (change in percent of urban and rural-nonfarm population, change in population per square mile, change in percent of population born out of state and change in percent of labor force employed in nonagricultural occupations) was selected and a 10-item factor-weighted index of change in the degree of urbanization was constructed.

3. Although our data are for counties and do not, as such, include information for urban areas alone, an indicator of urban-rural dichotomy (for Hypotheses 5 and 6) was created by factor analysis of the 1960 data in order to dichotomize the counties as of 1960 as relatively rural or urban. To be consistent with the urbanization measure, the factor coefficients of all ten variables underlying the conceptually relevant factor were used to develop a composite scale (factor score) indicating the degree of urbanity of the counties in 1960. Based on these factor scores, the counties were divided into two categories: eleven counties with high urbanity and twelve counties with low urbanity. Those with low urbanity include: Wolfe (Ky.), Livingston (La.), Union (La.), Lawrence (Miss.), Neshoba (Miss.), Tunica (Miss.), Anson (N.C.), Ashe (N.C.), Robeson (N.C.), Hancock (Tenn.), Houston (Tenn.), and Union (Tenn.), Out of the 12 with low urbanity, eight do not have any urban population at all, indicating that the dichotomy is reasonably valid. The high-urbanity counties are: Clarke (Ala.), Fayette (Ala.), Monroe (Ala.), Tallapoosa (Ala.), Harlan (Ky.), Perry (Ky.), Whitley (Ky.), Nachitoches (La.), Clay (Miss.), Holmes (Miss.), and Humphreys (Tenn.).

4. An index of socioeconomic status based on information about the respondent's education, occupation, and level of living (in terms of material possessions) was constructed. Since the socioeconomic characteristics of the respondents in 1960 and 1973 were relatively homogeneous, income was used as a separate variable. A factor analysis validated the assumption that a level-of-living scale would be more discriminating than income.

Education - Data on the education of the household head were precoded in categories representing years of education completed. According to the 1960 survey, less than 12% had completed high school, or gone further, whereas in the 1973 survey 27% were at this educational level. In both years a third of the sample had had some high school. In the 1960 sample, approximately 55% had completed elementary school or less. In the 1973 survey, the number to go no farther than elementary school had decreased to 39%.

Occupation - The occupations of the household heads were divided into seven categories. According to the 1960 study, over a third of the household heads were farmers and farm managers. In 1973, this number was reduced to 13%. In the 1973 sample, the majority of the heads were laborers, with 26.9% falling in this category.

Income - Since the average dollar income of families in the study area almost doubled between 1960 and 1973, scores for family income were assigned differently for 1960 and 1973.

Level-of-Living - In both the 1960 and 1973 surveys, 21 material items frequently found in level of living measures were included. For the present study nine items were used to build a Guttman scale of level of living. Both measures make satisfactory Guttman scales.

SES index - For the measure of socioeconomic status the indexes of education, occupation, income and level of living for both samples were factor analyzed. The data analysis showed that occupation, education, and level of living are useful measures of socioeconomic status, while income is too unstable to be included. Furthermore, level of living itself can be an indicator of the level of family income. Thus, occupation, education, and level of living were used to build an index of socio economic status, and income is used as a separate variable.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

As indicated before, we have two related samples of low-income rural counties, one in 1960 and the other in 1973. According to our first hypothesis, there was a difference (an increase over time) in mean anomy scores of the two related 23-county samples between 1960 and 1973. The median test was used to test this hypothesis and the result is presented in Table 1. Although anomy increased over the time period, the change was not statistically significant. The lack of a statistically significant relationship between time and anomy means that the observed relationship may be a result of sampling error and, thus, the results may not be generalized to the assumed population (i.e., all Southern, low-income rural counties).

(Tables 1 and 2 About Here)

Table 2 presents the results of the data analysis for the second hypothesis, that there was a decrease of alienation during the period 1960-1973. The data indicate that there has been a slight decrease (8.7%), although it is not statistically significant. Thus, our hypothesis is not strongly supported, but there was a trend of decreasing alienation

during the time period. Our findings in Tables 1 and 2 seem to cast doubt on the belief that once anomy and alienated world views emerge, they take on patterns of stability (Fromm, 1941; Keniston, 1960; Pearlin, 1963; Seeman, 1966; Lewis, 1965).

(Table 3 About Here)

To test the third hypothesis, positing a positive relationship between social change (as measured by change in urbanization) and anomy change, Kendall's rank correlation coefficient was obtained. According to Table 3, the relationship is not statistically significant. Furthermore, contrary to our prediction, the tendency is for anomy to decline as the degree of urbanization increases. However, the data in Table 3 indicate that the fourth hypothesis, that as the degree of urbanization increases alienation decreases, is more strongly supported. Thus, contrary to common theories, our findings suggest that social change does not necessarily have a negative impact on the human mind; anomy and alienation decreased as the degree of urbanization increased.

(Tables 4 and 5 About Here)

Tables 4 and 5 present the results of the tests of the relationship between urbanization and anomy or alienation with the degree of urbanity controlled. Although the data in Table 4 do not confirm Hypothesis 4, the data imply that anomy increased most in counties experiencing the least change in urbanization and this relationship is strongest in counties that were in 1960 the most urbanized. Contrary to this, the analysis presented in Table 5 suggests that alienation has declined most in these counties that experienced the most urbanization regardless of the initial level and that the strongest negative association was in the counties that were the least urbanized initially (in 1960), although the difference between the two

correlations is not as large as had been expected. The findings suggest that not all change is disruptive and some kinds of social change in a certain area may even have a positive impact on the human mental state. Thus, according to our data, the more rapidly urbanization occurs, the less anomic people become. Does this finding negate the validity of classical theories, e.g., Durkheim's theory of anomie and social change? With the present limited data and information it is difficult to say yes or no. The writer's hunch is that rapid urbanization may have both positive and negative impacts on the human mind. One positive aspect of urbanization in the study counties may be that urbanization brings about better economic conditions and higher living standards and this may compensate for the disruptive effects of rapid change.

(Tables 6 and 7 About Here)

In Tables 6 and 7 age is controlled to clarify the original relationship between social change and anomy or alienation. Table 6 suggests that there is a negative relationship between change in the degree of urbanization and anomy and the relationship is strongest among the old, though it is statistically not significant. In Table 7 a similar result is shown. In this case, however, there is a significant negative relationship between social change and alienation among the old and the relationship among the old is stronger than that among the young. Although we have few or no empirical studies of the relationship between urbanization phenomena and alienation among people of different ages, it has been documented that older people more often experience physical illness and suffer from social isolation, depression and despair (Cumming and Henry, 1961; Lystadt, 1972) that would tend to increase feelings of alienation. Our data, however, suggest that increasing urbanization may have a positive influence on the

aged in these areas and little impact on the younger people.

(Tables 8 and 9 About Here)

Srole (1956a, 1956b) reports that anomia as measured by his scale is more prevalent among the lower than among the higher social classes. This hypothesis originated with Merton's (1938, 1957) theory of anomie, which has been supported by many empirical studies (Bell, 1957; Meier and Bell, 1959; Tumin and Collins, 1959; Mizruchi, 1960, 1964; McDill, 1961; Simpson and Miller, 1963; Rhodes, 1964). Also, a few studies have shown that lower class people are more resistant to rapid social change, perhaps because of their fear of an uncertain future and lack of adaptability in comparison to those of higher socioeconomic status (Stephenson, 1968). Our data in Table 8 suggest that for all rural socioeconomic levels the impact of increasing urbanization on psychological status is not disruptive. In fact, both status groups may welcome urbanization of the counties in which they live, although anomy decreased more among the higher status groups than the lower ones.

Similarly, alienation also decreased in both groups as urbanization increased and this negative relationship was significantly strong among the lower status groups throughout the counties (Table 9). Again, our analysis suggests that social change does not always have adverse effects on psychological states. Indeed, social change which accompanies urbanization may bring improvement in "services," which perhaps improves levels of living and may make for psychological betterment of the lower socioeconomic status groups. These conventional theories of social change (in particular, those related to urbanization, industrialization or modernization) and its impact on the mind need to be reexamined. Furthermore, the above findings cast doubt on such popular theories as those of rising expectations and

relative deprivation, since it appears to be the lower status people who become less alienated as low-income rural counties undergo development.

(Tables 10 and 11 About Here)

Since income is generally regarded as an important indicator of the socioeconomic status of an individual or family, family income was controlled separately and the results are presented in Tables 10 and 11. Table 10 indicates that differences in family income do not significantly alter the original relationship between urbanization and anomy. The relationship between the two variables is not significant for either the low-income families or the high-income families. However, according to Table 11, alienation among the lower-income groups declined significantly with increased urbanization. This finding is consistent with the result in Table 8, that increasing urbanization for the lower socioeconomic status groups accompanies the largest decline in alienation. Thus, like socioeconomic status, income specifies the relationship between urbanization and alienation.

(Tables 12 and 13 About Here)

Although a few studies have reported that females are more anomic or alienated than males in certain areas (Crowdon, 1970), it is difficult to predict the relationship between sex and anomy or alienation in its relation to social change. Empirical evidence in this area, also, is minimal. However, our data in Table 12 suggest that as urbanization progresses, anomy tends to decrease among both sexes and more so among males than females. Perhaps males in low-income areas welcome urbanization more than females do, or at least urbanization does not have as disruptive effects on their mental states as on those of females.

Finally, in Table 13, sex is controlled to identify the original relationship between social change and alienation. According to the data, the decline in alienation is significantly related to the increase of urbanization and this relationship holds for both sexes. Furthermore, sex seems to specify the original relationship in the sense that females showed more decrease of alienation than males did as urbanization increased. This finding is interesting in the sense that, while the disruptive impact of increasing urbanization seems the least for the males for the normative aspect of life (anomy), feelings of alienation (powerlessness and distrust) decreases most among the females as their counties were becoming more urbanized. The most decrease of alienation among the females is consistent with the most decrease of alienation among the aged, those of lower socio-economic status and those of lower income. These findings are consistent with each other in the sense that it is the people who were most deprived previously that showed the most decline in alienation as a result of increasing urbanization.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Classical theories suggest that both anomy and alienation should increase among low-income rural people experiencing rapid social change. In this study a theoretical argument was developed for distinguishing more sharply between anomy and alienation, so that a different question was stated for each.

In the test of the first hypothesis, that anomy had increased over the period 1960-73, anomy was found to have increased but not enough to be statistically significant. The findings for Hypotheses 3 and 5 appear contrary to the hypotheses; change in urbanization had an <u>inverse,</u> although

not significant, relationship to change in anomy and this relationship held regardless of differences in the degree of urbanity. Furthermore, this inverse relationship was not significantly altered by age, sex, socioeconomic status or family income.

As predicted by Hypothesis 2, there was a decrease in alienation, though not enough to be statistically significant. Hypothesis 4 was confirmed and our index of urbanization change was a useful predictor of decline in alienation, as hypothesized. This relationship was not significantly influenced by county differences in the degree of urbanity and thus Hypothesis 6 was not supported, although a trend was suggested as hypothesized. However, the inverse relationship of urbanization and alienation was not generalizable in the sense that it was relatively stronger for the old, those of lower socioeconomic status, and low-income groups, which had the greatest declines in alienation over the period of the study. This finding suggests that something about increasing urbanization--possibly improved socioeconomic and welfare programs -- resulted in notable declines in alienation for these groups.

These findings cast some doubt on the popular theories of social change and suggest that social change does not always adversely affect psychological states. In particular, change in parts of society that in some sense have lagged behind other parts of society may have a positive effect--that is, it may be integrative rather than disorganizing. The issue may be whether people regard the change as "developmental" for themselves and their county.

Moreover, there is some indication that anomy change responds to a different set of conditions in comparison to alienation change. For this reason as well as that anomy increased while alienation decreased, the

distinction between anomy and alienation seems important. Not only do they vary differently over time, but also they respond to different sets of causal variables.

Finally, it might be added, the findings in this study contain an important implication for policy decisions. Although anomy increased from 1960 to 1973 in general, our data suggest that rather than the increase being a result of rapid social change, it may be the lack of urbanization that is responsible for the overall increase of anomy. Alienation, on the other hand, has decreased and the decline is much more substantial (significant) in relation to increasing urbanization. Thus, contrary to the supposed conflict between social change theory and the efforts of local leaders and residents to "develop" their areas because they see it as meaning a better life, this study suggests that the conflict may be eliminated by necessary revisions of the theory. That is, if lagging areas welcome change in order to "catch up" and if rapid urbanization may increase rather than decrease the psychological well-being of the low-income rural residents of such areas, there may be theoretical support for the efforts to "modernize" and "develop" such areas.

TABLE 1. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TIME AND ANOMY

	1960	1973	Total
Counties Above Median on Anomy	9(39.1%)	13(56.5)	22
Counties Below Median on Anomy	14(60.9)	10(43.5)	24
Total	23(100)	23(100)	46

Median = 4.54
% difference = 17.4
X^2 = .79 (not significant)

TABLE 2. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TIME AND ALIENATION

	1960	1973	Total
Counties Above Median on Alienation	11(47.8%)	9(39.1)	20
Counties Below Median on Alienation	12(52.2)	14(60.9)	26
Total	23(100)	23(100)	46

Median = 3.36
% difference = -8.7
X^2 = .09 (not significant)

TABLE 3. KENDALL COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN URBANIZATION AND DEPENDENT VARIABLES

Dependent Variables	Tau	N	Level of Significance
1. Anomy	-.21	23	.08 (N.S.*)
2. Alienation	-.28	23	.03 (significant)

*N.S. = not significant at the .05 level in one-tailed test.

TABLE 4. KENDALL COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN URBANIZATION AND ANOMY BY URBANITY

Anomy by Urbanity	Tau	N	Level of Significance
Counties with High Urbanity	-.25	11	.41 (N.S.)
Counties with Low Urbanity	-.15	12	.25 (N.S.)

TABLE 5. KENDALL COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN URBANIZATION AND ALIENATION BY URBANITY

Alienation by Urbanity	Tau	N	Level of Significance
Counties with High Urbanity	-.24	11	.16 (N.S.)
Counties with Low Urbanity	-.30	12	.09 (N.S.)

TABLE 6. KENDALL COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN URBANIZATION AND ANOMY BY AGE

Anomy by Age	Tau	N	Level of Significance
1. The Young	-.07	23	.33 (N.S.)
2. The Old	-.23	23	.06 (N.S.)

TABLE 7. KENDALL COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN URBANIZATION AND ALIENATION BY AGE

Alienation by Age	Tau	N	Level of Significance
1. The Young	-.18	23	.18 (N.S.)
2. The Old	-.31	23	.02 (significant)

TABLE 8. KENDALL COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN URBANIZATION AND ANOMY BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

Anomy by SES	Tau	N	Level of Significance
1. High SES	-.18	23	.18 (N.S.)
2. Low SES	-.10	23	.26 (N.S.)

TABLE 9. KENDALL COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN URBANIZATION AND ALIENATION BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

Alienation by SES	Tau	N	Level of Significance
1. High SES	-.21	23	.08 (N.S.)
2. Low SES	-.35	23	.01 (Significant)

TABLE 10. KENDALL COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN URBANIZATION AND ANOMY BY FAMILY INCOME

Anomy by Family Income	Tau	N	Level of Significance
1. High Income	-.17	23	.13 (N.S.)
2. Low Income	-.16	23	.14 (N.S.)

TABLE 11. KENDALL COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN URBANIZATION AND ALIENATION BY FAMILY INCOME

Alienation by Family Income	Tau	N	Level of Significance
1. High Income	-.18	23	.18 (N. S.)
2. Low Income	-.30	23	.02 (significant)

TABLE 12. KENDALL COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN URBANIZATION AND ANOMY BY SEX

Anomy by Sex	Tau	N	Level of Significance
1. Male	-.20	23	.10 (N.S.)
2. Female	-.09	23	.27 (N.S.)

TABLE 13. KENDALL COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN URBANIZATION AND ALIENATION BY SEX

Alienation by Sex	Tau	N	Level of Significance
1. Male	-.26	23	.04 (significant)
2. Female	-.30	23	.02 (significant)

REFERENCES

Balander, G. 1970. "Socio-cultural Unbalance and Modernization in the Underdeveloped Countries." In Readings in Social Evolution and Development, edited by S.N. Eisenstadt. New York: Pergamon Press.

Bell, Wendell. 1957. "Anomie, Social Isolation and the Class Structure." Sociometry 20:105-16.

Berger, Peter L., Brigitte Berger, and Hansfreied Kellner. 1973. The Homeless Mind: Modernization and Consciousness. New York: Random House.

Crowden, John J. 1970. Alienation Among Low-Income People in Appalachia. Unpublished dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Kentucky.

Cumming, Elaine, and William E. Henry. 1961. Growing Old. New York: Basic Books.

Durkheim, Emile. 1964. The Division of Labor in Society. Translated by George Simpson. New York: Free Press.

_____. 1966. Suicide. Translated by John A. Spalding and George Simpson. New York: Free Press.

_____. 1973. Moral Education. Translated by Everett K. Wilson and Herman Schnufer. New York: Free Press.

Eisenstadt, S.N. 1966. Modernization: Protest and Change. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Etzioni, Amitai. 1968. "Basic Human Needs, Alienation and Inauthenticity," American Sociological Review 33:870-881.

Fischer, Claude S. 1973. "On Urban Alienation and Anomie: Powerlessness and Social Isolation," American Sociological Review 38:311-326.

Freeman, H.E. and J. M. Giovannoni. 1969. "Social Psychology of Mental Health." In Handbook of Social Psychology. Vol. 5, edited by Gardner Linzey and Elliott Aronson. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Fromm, Erich. 1941. Escape from Freedom. New York: Rinehart.

Gamson, William A. 1968. Power and Discontent. New York: MacMillan.

Gibbs, Jack and Walter Martin. 1962. "Urbanization, Technology and the Division of Labor: International Patterns," American Sociological Review 27:667-77.

Gouldner, Alvin W. 1967. "Introduction." In Emile Durkheim, Socialism. Translated by Charlotte Sattler. New York: Collier.

Guttman, Louis. 1950. "The Basis for Scalogram Analysis." In Samuel A. Stouffer, et. al., Measurement and Prediction. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Keniston, Kenneth. 1960. The Uncommitted: Alienated Youth in American Society. New York: Harcourt, Brace.

Lauer, R. H. and J. C. Lauer. 1964. "The Experience of Change: Tempo and Stress." In Explorations in Social Change, edited by George K. Zollschan and Walter Hirsh. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Lerner, Daniel. 1958. The Passing of Traditional Society. New York: Free Press.

Lewis, Oscar. 1965. LaVida: A Puerto Rican Family in the Culture of Poverty. New York: Random House.

Lopreato, Joseph. 1967. Peasants No More. San Francisco: Chandler.

Lystadt, Mary H. 1972. "Social Allienation: A Review of Current Literature." The Sociological Quarterly 13:90-113.

Marks, Stephen R. 1974. "Durkheim's Theory of Anomie." American Journal of Sociology 80:329-63.

Marlowe, Leigh. 1971. Social Psychology: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Human Behavior. Boston: Holbrook.

Marx, Karl. 1964. Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts. In Karl Marx: Early Writings, edited by T. B. Bottomore. New York: McGraw-Hill.

McDill, Edward. 1961. "Anomie, Authoritarianism, Prejudice, and Socio-Economic Status: An attempt at Clarification." Social Forces 39:239-45.

Meier, Dorothy L. and Wendell Bell. 1959. "Anomie and Differential Access to the Achievement of Life Goals," Americal Sociological Review 24:190-202.

Merton, Robert K. 1938. "Social Structure and Anomie," American Sociological

_____. 1957. Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: Free Press.

_____. 1964. "Anomie, Anomia, and Social Interaction: Contexts of Deviant Behavior." In Anomia and Deviant Behavior, edited by Marshall B. Clinard, New York: Free Press.

Mizruchi, Ephraim H. 1960. "Social Structure and Anomia in a Small City." American Sociological Review 25:645-54.

_____. 1964. Sucess and Opportunity: A Study of Anomie. New York: Free Press.

Murphy, H. B. M. 1961. "Social Change and Mental Health." Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly 39:385-445.

Neal, Arthur G. and Melvin Seeman. 1964. "Organizations and Powerlessness: A Test of the Mediation Hypothesis." American Sociological Review 29:216-26.

Nisbet, Robert A. 1967. The Sociological Tradition. New York: Basic Books.

Pearlin, L. 1963. "Alienation from Work: A Study of Nursing Personnel." American Sociological Review 27:314-325.

Rhodes, L. 1964. "Anomia, Aspiration, and Status." Social Forces 42:434-40.

Richards, Leonard L. 1970. Gentlemen of Poverty and Standing: Anti-Abolition Mobs in Jacksonian America. New York: Oxford University Press.

Schacht, Richard. 1970. Alienation. Garden City, New York: Doubleday.

Seeman, Melvin. 1966. "Alienation, Membership, and Political Knowledge." Public Opinion Quarterly 30:353-367.

_____. 1972. "Alienation and Engagement." In The Human Meaning of Social Change, edited by A. Campbell and P. E. Converse. New York Russell Sage Foundation.

_____. 1975. "Alienation Studies." In Annual Review of Sociology, edited by A. Inkeles, J. Coleman, and N. Smelser. Palo Alto, California: Annual Reviews Inc.

Sharp, L. 1952. "Steel Axes for Stone Age Australians." In Human Problems in Technological Change, edited by Edward H. Spicer. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Simpson, Richard L. and H. Max Miller, 1963. "Social Status and Anomia." Social Problems 10:256-64.

Smelser, Neil J. 1959. Social Change in the Industrial Revolution. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

_____. 1963. "Mechanisms of Change and Adjustment of Changes." In Industrialization and Society, edited by Wilbert E. Moore and Bert F. Hoselitz, et al.

Sorokin, Pitrim A. 1942. The Crisis of Our Age. New York: Dutton.

Srole, Leo. 1956a. "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries: An Exploratory Study." American Sociological Review 21:709-16.

_____. 1956b. "Anomie, Authoritarianism, and Prejudice." American Journal of Sociology 62:63-67.

Stephenson, John B. 1968. Shiloh. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press.

Toffler, Alvin. 1970. Future Shock. New York: Random House.

Tumin, Melvin M. and Roy C. Collins. 1959. "Status Mobility and Anomie: A Study in Readiness for Desegration," British Journal of Sociology 10:233-38.

United States Department of Agriculture. 1955. Development of Agriculture's Human Resources: A Report on Problems of Low-Income Farmers. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.